

Appl No. 10/828,450

Amdt. dated April , 2005

Reply to Office Action of March 3, 2005

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the specification, there is an amendment that points out that a sighting fin of the embodiment has the general shape of a fin of a fish having a top edge which is a sighting surface.

Claim 2, and 4-7, as amended, claim 8 and new claim 9 are currently in the application. Claims 1 and 3 have been cancelled.

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller. Claim 1 has been cancelled but matter that was in claim 1 is now included in newly added claim 9.

The rejection interprets Miller as stating that "[L]ip (12) including line (13) serves as the claimed sighting fin having a horizontal surface that extends rearward from a boundary of the face plate." Claim 9 calls for "a sighting fin with the general shape of a fin of a fish with a top edge that forms a sighting surface...that extends along the centerline to a location rearward of a rear wall of the body..." Nothing in Miller has the general shape of a fin of a fish that extends to a location rearward of a rear wall of the body. Additionally, claim 9 states that the fin forms a pointer. Miller's line (13) does not form a pointer. For the above stated reasons, claim 9 is

Appl No. 10/828,450

Amdt. dated April , 2005

Reply to Office Action of March 3, 2005

allowable over Miller. Since claim 5 (amended) depends from claim 9, it is also allowable.

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dalton who shows two golf clubs. One golf club includes a cylindrical body with an edge normal to a striking surface. Additionally, a sight line may be provided on a surface of the body.

Another of Dalton's golf clubs has a horizontal portion which is allegedly a horizontal sighting surface

What Claim 9 calls for is "a sighting fin with the general shape of a fin of a fish, said fin having a bottom edge that extends along the centerline to a location rearward of the body from a region of a boundary between said plate and the body where the fin forms a pointer that points away from the body in a direction perpendicular to said striking surface." Nothing in Dalton is what is called for in claim 9 which has been described hereinbefore, in connection with Miller's patent. Therefore, claim 9 is allowable over Dalton. Since claim 6 (amended) depends from claim 9, it is also allowable.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7 are rejected under 34 U.S.C 103(a) as being

Appl No. 10/828,450

Amdt. dated April , 2005

Reply to Office Action of March 3, 2005

unpatentable over Taylor in view of Micciche and Hockerson.

Taylor has an objective of providing a putter where a center of mass of a club head of the putter and shape of its shaft are chosen to face balance the putter.

The office action alleges that "Taylor shows every feature laimed except a plate connected to the front face..." Claim 9 of the application is to is to a putter that includes "a sighting fin with the general shape of a fin of a fish, said fin having a bottom edge that extends along the centerline of the body to a location rearward of the body from a region of a boundary between said plate and the body where the fin forms a pointer that points away from the body in a direction perpendicular to said striking surface."

There is nothing in Taylor to even remotely suggest the sighting fin.

The patents of Micciche and Hockerson teach important aspects of providing a striking surface of a putter. However, since claims 2, 4 and 7 depend from claim 9 which has been shown to be allowable. Therefore, claims 2, 4 and 7 are also allowable.

For reasons given hereinbefore, examination of claim 9 and


Appl No. 10/828,450

Amdt. dated April , 2005

Reply to Office Action of March 3, 2005

claims 2-7 as amended and reconsideration of claim 8 and an early allowance thereof is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Leonard Weiss  
871 Coronado Ctr. Dr.  
Suite 200  
Henderson, NV 89052

Tel: (702) 952-2808

Fax: (702) 952-2809

Appl No. 10/828,450

Amdt. dated April , 2005

Reply to Office Action of March 3, 2005

**Amendment to the Drawing:**

The attached sheet of drawing includes a change to Fig. 4. This sheet, which includes Figs. 3 and 4 replaces the original sheet including Figs. 3 and 4. In Figure 4, a previously omitted reference number 39 has been added.